

REMARKS

Claims 1-54 were pending and presented for examination and in this application. In an Office action dated January 19, 2006, claims 1-3, 5-20, 22-24, 26-35, 37-51, and 53-58 were rejected. Applicant thanks Examiner for examination of the claims pending in this application and addresses Examiner's comments below.

Response to Rejection of Double Patenting

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejects claims 1-3, 5-20, 22-24, 26-35, 37-51, and 53-58 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as allegedly being unpatentable in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,574,195. ("Roberts"). The Examiner further states that these claims merely broaden the scope of claims 1-54 of Roberts. Applicant submits herewith a terminal disclaimer with the Amendment and Response. The basis of this rejection should now be obviated. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the claims.

Conclusion

Applicant has added new claims 59-75 for which Applicant requests consideration, examination, and allowance. Applicant respectfully submits that these are supported by the specification and are commensurate within the scope of protection to which Applicant believes he is entitled.

In addition, Applicant respectfully invites Examiner to contact Applicant's representative at the number provided below if Examiner believes it will help expedite furtherance of this application.

Respectfully Submitted,
LAWRENCE G. ROBERTS

Date: April 18, 2006

By:



Rajiv P. Patel, Attorney of Record
Registration No. 39,327
FENWICK & WEST LLP
801 California Street
Mountain View, CA 94041
Phone: (650) 335-7607
Fax: (650) 938-5200